

2006

Daniel CannCasciato interview

Daniel CannCasciato

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/cwura_interviews

Recommended Citation

CannCasciato, Daniel, "Daniel CannCasciato interview" (2006). *CWU Retirement Association Interviews*. Book 97.
http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/cwura_interviews/97

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives and Special Collections at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in CWU Retirement Association Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

CWU LIVING HISTORY PROJECT

Daniel CannCasciato

(Transcription of Side 1)

KB Hello, today is Friday, February 24, the year 2006. And I'm Karen Blair, about to interview Daniel CannCasciato, Librarian at Central Washington University, and head of the union that just negotiated the contract that the faculty approved a few days ago.

Thank you for agreeing to talk about your role on campus, especially with the union. Would you be willing to start a little bit about your background before you came, when you came to Central, what your hats have been here?

DC Sure. My name is Daniel CannCasciato, spelled capital C-a-n-n-capital C-a-s-c-i-a-t-o. And I came to Central in October of 1995 from the University of Oregon, where I'd been a librarian, and I'm now head of Cataloging here at Central. And I've been in the Brooks Library since October of 1995, and have been head of Cataloging. I was very briefly, for a period of two years, also the head of Interlibrary Loan.

And outside the library – and part of the reason I'm being interviewed today – has to do with other roles on campus. And that started really around I think it was fall of 1999, when I became a [Central Washington University Faculty] Senator.

I got active in the Senate at a time when we also had a new president [McIntyre], or had a transitional period before hiring a new president, and was active in the Senate. And, I think, my second year on the Senate, I became a member of the Executive Committee. And then, a year or two of that led to me being Chair-elect to the Senate in 2002-2003. And then in 2004, I was Chair of the Senate.

And then that experience led me also to become interested in also the growing union movement, or interest in unionization on campus; and the fact that enabling legislation had been passed in 2002, which meant that if we actually voted for a union, then it would have to be recognized.

And that was, I thought, a very important change in the process, because even as far back as 1997 – which isn't very far back in the University history, but for mine, it's almost all of it – is when we first voted to have a union recognized, during Ivory Nelson's tenure as President.

And that was, you know, summarily rejected by the Administration because they chose to work with the Senate, which was completely legitimate and fine from their point of view.

However, that was just something that was in the back of my mind that was very different starting in 2002, which was if you vote for a union through the approved process, then it's not up to the University. The State has already said that if this happens, and because of – and the way the legislation was worded – “to ensure full participation in shared governance,” and a lot of the issues that I became interested in as Chair of the Senate and as a Senator, it actually *had* to happen.

KB Thanks for the details and dates and specifics. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about your observations in the Senate about how faculty governance worked, shared governance worked. What are the thoughts that inspired you to get active in the Faculty Senate, and then to get active in the union?

DC OK. First, active in the Senate was, I guess, as I was sitting there, Josh Nelson was the Chair of the Senate that year. And, you know, [he was] just a great guy, and profoundly interested in the University, and in the role of faculty in the University, and the betterment of the University.

And so really, I was just inspired that way. And I found that when I'm a member of a committee, or a member of some sort of group that has something to do, or presents a program, say, at a State conference under, say, a State library association, that if I'm actively involved, I get more out of it.

So, I chose to be more active, more participatory, as a Senator than a lot of the other Senators on campus, and found that that was interesting. And [found that] some of the activities that we chose to be involved in, you know, we could influence and have results; and some that we chose to be involved in, we were more marginalized than I really thought was appropriate.

It struck me as odd, over my years in the Senate, to recognize that in all other aspects of my professional life – And I'm encouraged, as a librarian, to be active in organizations, be an active leader, have decision-making authority, be somebody who can be part of the actual governance, and have a profound and real say in what happens.

And, however, as a member of the Senate, and as a member of the Exec Committee, and as Chair of the Senate, there were areas in my home institution where that was not something that was either encouraged, or something that I was able to actually realize in a way that I thought was appropriate.

Because when I looked around, especially as Chair-elect and then Chair of the Senate, and I became in contact more and more with faculty across campus, it's just a really impressive intellectual resource that I thought was being marginalized in a way that was kind of a waste.

KB You're general. I wonder if you have specific incidents that you thought faculty should have a bigger role in deciding?

DC Well, I think one of the ... well, two of them. And both of these are kind of focused on financials.

But one was my activity in the Salary Administration Board process for faculty salaries. And the fact that while we were having salaries addressed, or some adjustments made based on that process in relation to our peer institutions, or whatever our peer group was – in this case, the CUPA categories – we weren't having a say or an effect on merit money, or COLA money; that, as faculty, [we] were losing ground in other ways, [and] nothing was really being done to address that.

And when we tried to make that happen, or at least have some input into ... my one year ... when I was Chair of the Senate, you also are a member of the Budget Advisory Committee. So I tried to get involved in the discussions for the Budget Advisory Committee, because I thought that would be important.

And the amount of money that comes to the Academic Affairs side of the University has a direct impact on how much, from within that large pool, is available for salaries or adjustments and all that kind of thing.

And I thought that would be a real important discussion to have. And [I] was completely unable to even get that going. The first time I saw the budget, the actual budget proposal, was at the

Budget Advisory Committee meeting to approve that proposal, which I thought wasn't the best way to go.

And which is why we, as the Exec Committee that year, and with the help of, I think, the Salary Administration Board Committee, the Personnel Committee, the Budget Committee – all these, you know – the Salary Administration Board was a University committee, the other two are Senate committees – all unanimously decided to go forward and vote “no” for the faculty on that budget.

And in its place, or in place of some of the information on it, we said, “For the money, instead of going to the Salary Administration Board, or in addition, we need COLA money and merit money.”

And that was, again, not a discussion that really happened. There was a couple exchanges of memos between the Senate and the President's office, as far as where the money could come from, how it could be appropriated. But it wasn't really kind of a peer-to-peer discussion.

KB Do you care to target some of the individuals in the Administration who were unwilling to accommodate?

DC Well, the response we got – uh – the President's memo back to us was – I'm sorry, this was in 2003-2004, so [in the] spring of 2004, this was President [Jerilyn] McIntyre.

And I had one discussion with Provost Soltz. One of his asides was, “Well, where would the money come from?”

And it's kind of a legitimate question. The idea that the Senate has enough information to say overall where the money would come from is a little questionable, because we really don't have access to all the books.

And if we'd been involved in the discussion in the fall, as to where the money of the University goes first – where the big money division happened – then we could talk a little bit more about why there's money now for faculty salaries. But we weren't involved in that.

However, we went back and looked. We have people on the Senate Budget Committee, people on the Salary Administration Board, who could look at the money. I went and looked at the proposed budget, and money that was available from one-time funds that could go for one-time monies or purchases.

And then, money that was in recurring funds, rather than using that on items that could be in one-time purchases, I said, “Direct that to salary increases, and leave these things. Because we know enrollment is going to increase; we know that certain things are going to happen.

“You can afford to do this as one-time purchases when you're buying equipment, because it is a set, single cost. And the ongoing budget obligations for salaries can then come out of the recurring funds that you have not touched for things that can be one-time costs.”

And it was just summarily rejected.

There could have been, you know – the President – well, I think it came from the President's Office. But the response that came from the President and the Provost represented their view. And that was pretty much the extent of the discussion.

And that was the part that left me unhappy with the process. Obviously, I didn't like the results either, and most faculty didn't. But the process itself was something that I was concerned about.

Especially when you're Chair of the Senate and you realize that in the idea of shared governance, if you have somebody who's in a governance position for one year, always cycling through, that person is always going to be at something of a disadvantage to people who are in their positions as permanent as those positions are – President, Provost, Business Affairs.

You know, Rich Corona has been, I think, in that area for 15 years. Obviously, they know more. For the incoming Chair of the Senate, it's a steep learning curve, and then you're out.

For a lot of faculty, that works out great, because they really do want to get back to what they're doing, you know, to their academic interests. And I shared that interest. I just wasn't happy in the process while I was there.

So, at the same time, we had the interest in unionization. I think in my Chair-elect year, we had the hard drive and the vote to unionize or not; and that's when we voted to unionize – or, voted to have the election to unionize. And then in my –

KB Do you remember how much support there was for that?

DC Uh-h-h ... *oh rats* ... no. The vote to actually unionize or not was done in June of 2004 – or, counted in June of 2004 – and was a 63% to 37% yes and no vote. So, pretty well supported.

And then, we finally formed a bargaining team I think, at the end. Finally going forward to unionize and start having the discussion and becoming a recognized part of University life, we had to then bargain. And so, we formed a bargaining team with the help of our American Federation of Teachers national representative, Gary Pagels.

We formed a bargaining team in, I think, late February or early March of 2005. And then, that was really just a great piece of work by Gary. He took input from a lot of faculty. And he and I discussed it.

At that time, I had been elected Chair – er, I'm sorry, President of the United Faculty of Central as of ... I believe it was also in June of 2004, or May of 2004.

KB 2004 or 2005?

DC 2005! You're right. Thank you.

KB Who were the presidents and activists in United Faculty of Central before you took the top spot?

DC Very good! The President was Susan Donahoe and the Vice President was Lila Harper. And they had been long-time members of the union, and long-time supporters.

Susan was very instrumental – and I believe Lila as well, but I don't know for sure – in getting the enabling legislation passed. They had worked with, I think it was, the WEA lobbyist, Wendy Rader-Konafalski. And, also from the AFT, the national rep who was here at that time was Troy Brazell. And they really saw that through for a number of years, in finally getting that legislation passed.

KB So they went to Olympia and talked to legislators?

DC They went to Olympia. They were, I think, in the picture – literally – when the Governor signed the legislation when it was finally approved.

KB Which governor was that?

DC Governor Locke.

KB How long have you been a dues-paying member?

DC I can't remember for sure. It's either spring of 2002 or spring of 2003 is when I joined and also became an officer at that time, the Treasurer.

KB And at that time, how warm was faculty support for the union? How many paid dues?

DC Paid dues at that time ... 40-ish members out of ...

KB ... 300-and-some?

DC Well, there were, say, 330 or 340 tenure-track faculty. And the membership at that time was limited to tenure-track faculty and at least half-time, I think, non-tenure-track faculty.

And union membership now is right ... well, just over 180 paid members, or dues-paying members. And we represent basically all the faculty now on campus, which includes all tenure-track and all non-tenure-track faculty, whether they're at least one-sixth or not.

KB And how many –

DC Our best estimate is in the neighborhood of 600, or a little bit over 600. It fluctuates every quarter.

And right now, we're working – well, we're interested in working with the University to get a little better handle on who's actually on the payroll and when, each quarter; because we have a responsibility now to be able to talk to those people, and identify them, and let them know that we exist.

So our dues-paying membership has grown quite a bit, with the result of the bargaining process and, I think, the legitimacy – er, let me think – the profile, really, of the members of the bargaining team. It is really a very good group. And then also, with some results.

And I think after the contract, the tentative contract, came out for public view in late January of this year, 2006, our membership has increased by in the neighborhood of 50 members as a result of that.

KB And how are dues calculated?

DC Dues are – unfortunately, they were set on a percentage basis of your salary with a maximum. And now, they're set on your status as a faculty member – whether you're tenure-track or non-tenure track. And if you're non-tenure track, whether or not – if you're *annual* non-tenure track, what your percentage of employment is. Are you 50 % to 100% or 25% to 49%? And are you below that and/or are you quarterly? If you're quarterly, they're also at the lowest rate.

KB Can you provide some members what would –

DC Unfortunately, I didn't bring my paper with me. But it's in the neighborhood of, for tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty, \$604. For annual contract faculty, about \$465 annually, in 18 easy payments with your paycheck. And a quarter contract is right about \$180, a little more than \$18 per pay period.

KB Now, to me, it sounds like it's a little higher. I think as a professor last year, I paid something like \$500 dues.

DC Right. Before, when we were on the percentage basis, the maximum was \$550. But because we are associated with two national organizations and two state organizations, we have to pay our dues to those groups each. And then, we add on the local dues, which are \$40, which comes back to us as United Faculty of Central.

KB So we are members of two unions, the NEA and the AFT?

DC That's correct.

KB Is it unusual for a wedding of this kind to occur?

DC I don't know for sure that it's unusual. I know that it exists at other campuses. There are associated, there are combination, unions, such as AFT and AAUP and AFT and NEA. So it's not ... it's not unique or very ... what's the term? It's not terribly uncommon, but I don't know when that changed, or if it's kind of a 20-year practice or 50 years that they've started doing these kinds of associated unions.

I know that Michael Jennings from the University of Alaska, who is now here as of September of 2005 as the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development, was an AFT-AAUP associated union.

KB Now, it's AFT who sent Pagels?

DC Yes.

KB NEA did not send a representative?

DC That's correct. And we worked with the – on the WEA side, we worked with Gary McNeil, who is here in the state, and was part of building membership and building a positive vote for the union. He's part of organizing in that way, and he was here from the WEA-NEA Association.

KB When was that?

DC When was that ... during ... I guess it would have been 2003 and 2004. And then Gary Pagels got here from AFT also around ... January of 2004.

And one of the interesting, I think, parts of being associated with the national groups is that Gary Pagels, who's in charge of bargaining and kind of helping establish unions and helping them get started when they have become members, lives in Buffalo, New York. And part of – one of the really major benefits we get we thought was important by being associated with these national groups is, you know, you draw on experience and knowledge. And we don't pay anything special to have Gary fly out here. That's footed for by the national group.

And [on] Monday, he drives to the airport in Buffalo, and he's been doing that for 30 years, apparently. And for the last two years, his "bus ride" is across [the] country to Seattle. He gets in a car and he drives over to Ellensburg.

And he's been here for almost two years now, with a few substantial breaks of a few weeks for vacation and tax reasons, so it didn't look like he'd actually established a residence in the State of Washington, because he hasn't.

So we've had that, and that kind of support and experience, to help us get to where we are right now.

KB Has he solely helped our campus, Monday through Friday?

DC Pretty much, yeah.

KB Is he living in Ellensburg?

DC Yeah. He and Gary McNeil have also the responsibility of developing this group called UFWs, which is the United Faculty of Washington State, which is the umbrella group – or, the umbrella structure – for the unions at each of the regional campuses, or whatever develops in the state.

So right now, Eastern [Washington University] voted to unionize and is in negotiations. We unionized and are finishing negotiations; all we have to have is the board ratify the contract on March 3. And Western Washington University just voted to unionize yesterday, so they will now be forming a bargaining team, and going forward and negotiating.

And [all] are part of the United Faculty of Washington State, which is the umbrella group we're thinking predominantly [is] going to share information among us as a union group, so that we learn from each other; but also, to help us focus our message and what we want at the Legislature at Olympia.

KB Does Pagels have involvement with WAZZU [Washington State University], U Dub [University of Washington] or private schools in the state?

DC Not with private schools, as far as I know. And there is no membership or organizing committee yet at the U Dub or at WAZZU. And there was an organizing committee meeting Wednesday at Evergreen, because they have shown an interest and have actually formed a group to look into that.

So, he's involved in those groups. And ... how did I get here?

KB And so Pagels has had decades of experience?

DC Thank you. Yes. Yes. And that really showed. I mean, that really helped us in forming a bargaining team that was composed of just a number of people, some of whom were not union supporters.

And once the union came in, though, they are the sort of people that said, "OK, let's make this work." Which is what they were interested in, and what we were interested in – the idea of "let's make this work."

Because, one, we live and work here. And, you know, faculty tend to stay at the university where they get tenured, for 20 to 30 years. It's a substantial commitment of them.

Administration is more migratory, in a sense, than the rank-and-file faculty members. And so when they saw that the union was voted in, you know, in a completely legitimate process, they said, "Well, let's do what we can to make it work."

KB So, who were the opponents?

DC So, the former "no"-voting faculty members were Charlie Rubin from Geology; Wendy Bohrsen, also from Geology; and Bob Hickey, from Geography and .

And their only concern – their main concern – with making the union work was exactly what we wanted as well, which was to make the union work, and make the University a better place. And we kept that in mind throughout our whole process.

KB Who were the supporters who also served on your team?

DC Other members who also served on the team, and long-time supporters, were Pedro Bicchieri, a non-tenure-track faculty member from Asia University in International Studies; Minerva Caples from Education, and I think over 20 years of experience here at Central. I think Pedro's been here – well, the Bicchieri family has been here a long time, and I think Pedro's employment with the University is in the neighborhood of five years.

Terry DeVietti from Psychology has been here since the last 1960s, I believe. Peter Gries from Music, and a Department Chair as well. And he has been here since the early 1970s. Brenda Hubbard from Theater has been here since the early 1990s, and a former Department Chair as well. Keith Lewis from Art, who's been here, I think, about the same amount of time I have, about 10 years of experience.

And Bob Otta, who was a member, a non-tenure-track, and had split duties as a non-tenure-track member between Computer Sciences and Industrial and Engineering Technology; and resigned from the team in, I think, the summer of 2005, but he was a member from February until then, an active participant. And Pedro ended up having to resign from the team just because of the workload issues ... I think around October of 2005.

And to replace them – and somebody who stepped into sort of a negotiating process that was already in flow, was Karen Gookin from the English Department; but has been a non-tenure-track faculty member here since ... well, I think in the neighborhood of 20 years, possibly a little more than that.

So we had all total around, say, 200 years of experience at Central.

KB Did these people have any training or release time from their faculty –

DC Unfortunately, no. It ended up, I think in November, I got some reassigned time in my schedule to do this. Everybody else made this work by taking on the duty, and by their commitment. They got no reassigned time.

KB What kind of a time was involved?

DC The amount of time involved in drafting our first contract proposal, we figured out, last spring – when nobody had reassigned time; it was coming in in the evening hours after work – was in the neighborhood of, collectively, over 2,000 hours by June.

And then, you know, we continued through June, somewhat sporadically. And some negotiations – we tried to have some salary discussions, because of the legislative allotment of money towards the COLA, and that went absolutely nowhere during the summer. And then, we got back on track. We started some discussions in late August.

So from August on, there was a serious amount of time committed over days. So we would schedule bargaining sessions for two or three days, a couple of days a week, in September, October, November. We had two full days in December.

Then, we had a long break, and then we came back on January 9 and said we thought we were far enough along – both sides said this – “We think we should be done by the end of the week.”

And if we’re not, then from our point of view – the union side – we thought, well, if we’re not far enough along, if we’re not making progress, then we’ll just go to impasse [on] the items that were outstanding, which just involves bringing in a mediator.

But people have to set aside days. And the number of names I gave you was in the neighborhood of 12 or 13 members of a bargaining team, which is large. As it turns out – because of not having reassigned time, of not having an ability to count this necessarily, say, as a service commitment to the University and, you know, counted in regular workload as faculty members would – having a team that could show up when they could and still meet their primary obligations – and the, you know, obviously very important ones to them, of either serving as a Department Chair or serving as, you know, just a faculty member conducting the courses – worked out well for us.

KB So, people would step out for a couple hours and then come back?

DC Right, and come back in the middle of the negotiations. We’d catch them up to speed.

One person I forgot to mention – and this was a person who came in because Wendy Bohrsen did just a tremendous amount of work this spring and summer, somehow went on sabbatical and we couldn’t stop it. And so, she was in Santa Barbara.

And so we chose another faculty member, Steve Schepman, because we had interest from the College of Business to have somebody from the College of Business on the bargaining team. And when the [End of Side 1]

(Transcription of Side 2)

DC To get back on track, we told the College of Business folks – the few who said, you know, they wanted somebody from the College of Business on the bargaining team – “Come to the meetings when they’re there and be an active participant, and that would assure you participation.”

However, Gary Pagels made the commitment to them that when there’s an opening – and from his experience, he knew something would happen – that depending on what happens, “The first time we need to replace somebody, we will contact you.”

And we did that, and so we picked up Steve Schepman from Business Administration. And he's also the Chair of Business Administration. And he became a team member in late August, because Wendy was taking off on sabbatical and went to Santa Barbara.

Wendy – just to demonstrate the kind of commitment we got from all our faculty members – while on sabbatical, came back to campus the week before Halloween, in late October. And as it turned out, we had a bargaining session scheduled for Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday of Halloween weekend, the lead-up.

She was there in bargaining with us on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and half a day Sunday, and left so that she could catch a ride back to Seattle and get on her plane to go back to Santa Barbara. So, we just had a tremendous amount of commitment from some really impressive faculty members. And that was a great answer, just as a face of the union and the face of faculty interest, to Administration.

It was also very educational for us, or a way that we could provide education for the administrative team. Because they had good people, but people without necessarily the amount of experience at Central that necessarily helped all the time in discussions.

They had fresh ideas, you know, and were in a sense, unaccompanied by history of what we used to do here. But they were also naïve about some issues, one of them being – a very substantial one being the role of adjuncts.

And the term “adjunct” in a university, say, with a large labor pool – Seattle, Los Angeles, Berkeley for *godssakes* or San Francisco – an adjunct in Nuclear Science, you can pick up in a day and a half. At Central, in Ellensburg, not going to happen.

So the term adjunct here doesn't mean what they tended to think the term adjunct should be. And the status and the human relations aspect of what we wanted, and what we as the faculty, the union, were coming forward with for the way to treat our faculty, the people who are here.

Karen Gookin has been here 20 years. There's a woman, Wanda Fujimoto, in Business Administration, who's been on an annual contract for over 30 years. Every year, annual contract. That is not adjunct in any kind of casual employee sense of the word.

And that's one of the things we had to bring home.

And then we had Department Chairs – you know, Charlie Rubin had been a Department Chair, Brenda Hubbard had been a Department Chair, Peter Gries *is* a Department Chair, Steve Schepman *is* a Department Chair – so, being able to talk to the administrative team and tell them some of the procedural impacts of some proposals, whether they were our proposals or their proposals; and what that might mean – what that might mean in workload, what that might mean in simple logistics – was a tremendous help.

KB Before I ask you who served on the administrative team, I'd like to confirm then that Pagels is probably the only person who attended all of the meetings. Am I right?

DC That would be absolutely right. I missed probably five of the bargaining sessions. And my role was I was Chair of the bargaining team, so I'm the signatory on almost all the tentative agreements; and Peter Gries, on the couple days I wasn't there, signed it.

KB And what kind of input were you getting from the faculty, either union members or non-members, during this process?

DC Oh, during the actual bargaining process, there was no formal feedback mechanism, because that's just not the way you can make bargaining work. You can't have input from 500 people while you're trying to actually do the negotiation of a contract.

What we did in the months preceding, starting in, I believe, March of 2005, was we had discussion sessions, we had kind of focus group sessions with faculty – or available to faculty. Unfortunately, they were fairly poorly attended.

And we did a survey of faculty, specific issues, kind of rating what's important to you and how important, you know, on a scale of either 1 to 5 or 1 to 7, I can't remember what our scale was. And then, an area for comments.

And we had discussions with faculty as we were drafting the contract language. And – I'm sorry, go ahead.

KB Why was interest poor at the focus sessions, and what were the top priorities from the survey?

DC Good question. Why was interest, or at least participation, poor? I don't know.

As a Chair of the Senate and member of the – actually, I was Chair of the Salary Administration Board when we first tried to – came up with these Salary Administration Board plans. It's not surprising that there were very few people. I think that's just been our culture.

You know, when you have a general discussion session on an issue, or you ask faculty for feedback in general, it's fairly quiet.

KB Do you suppose they're cynical about the impact they can make?

DC You know, that could very well be it. And I think the hangover, or the kind of legacy, of the difference between the Senate going forward with a proposal versus the union going forward with something that absolutely has to be negotiated with the administrative group, is probably now more apparent than it was then.

And I would hope that we would have more active participation in the future, because very shortly, we will start looking at what would our bargaining issues in the future [be], what are our priorities.

KB What were the priorities?

DC Oddly enough – well, one thing that stood out, which was kind of odd, from the surveys – *the* thing that was circled and was the highest priority kind of numerically, was academic freedom. Which is odd, I say, as Chair of the Senate and in my years in the Senate, I haven't heard of any kind of grievance on this issue in the past; and I haven't heard from faculty in general that this has been a troubling issue.

But I think maybe it was a response to, one, just ensuring that it continues to be a matter of importance and integrity for the faculty.

KB So maybe there was fear that the union would interfere with the classroom?

DC Could be. That, and I was thinking also, possibly the political culture nationally is ... has some ... say, anti-academic and anti-professoried qualities to it; about the “over-liberal” faculty, I don’t know, somehow brainwashing our students.

When you look at the actual makeup of, say, the President, the Senate, the House at the national level, I don’t see where that’s coming from. It’s predominantly Republican at this point [chuckles], so I don’t know how the fear of brainwashing is there, but that is kind of in the marketplace of ideas out there nationally.

So it might have been a response to that as well. Or, you’re right, it could be fear that the union would – that, from union interests, it’s not important to us.

The thing I’ve started trying to do more often is refer to the union as the “Faculty Union,” because I think faculty forget that the union isn’t some alien group. When Gary Pagels came in to help us write a contract, he sat in the room and helped us write a contract based on the Faculty Code, our history, what we were interested in.

And by “helping write a contract,” he would literally be typing. He wasn’t telling us what we should be doing. And he at no point told us what we should be doing as far as content to the contract.

He did tell us how to conduct ourselves at times as a bargaining team. And we had bargaining team training in February of 2005, along with the Eastern folks, at Moses Lake. We had a full day and a half – well, actually, two days. We started on a Friday evening, full day Saturday, half a day Sunday.

And [we] had training sessions there about “What do you do as a bargaining team? How do you frame proposals? What are your interests? How do you narrow down what your interests are related to what you can go for legally, or under the legislation, versus kind of a [inaudible] view of what you want as faculty members in general, and your experiences in the Senate, and sort of faculty interests kind of across the board.

KB What did you learn from the training that surprised you, that you needed?

DC One of the most important things – which is different from our role in the Senate, and is very different from shared governance in the Senate versus as a union, the Faculty Union, and going forward with a proposal – is don’t do the other side’s work for them. Don’t make their argument for them. Don’t be – don’t do what you always do as a faculty member, which is look at a range of options, and try to choose something in the middle, because you think that may be ... you know, the pro-and-con argument.

What you want to do is frame what you want. Say why. Have very good reasons for that. And anticipate what some of the arguments might be, but then don’t move in that direction unless you really have to, unless the argument –

And, if convince yourself that where you started from isn’t going to stand, then move. But if you convince yourself that “Yeah, I can understand you saying that faculty don’t deserve, say, a 10% COLA this year.” But maybe they really do, and you can really make that argument.

So start there. Don’t start at percentage, because you think that’s all you can get. Don’t look at the State budget and say, “Oh, we can only do this for merit.” Because there’s a lot of money at the University. So, make the other side make their argument.

When we were talking about, say, workload, is one of the big changes in the contract versus what our history has been, we really wanted a change in the balance between teaching, scholarship and service. And as it turns out, so did the Administration.

Because they are very interested in enhancing the scholarship aspect primarily, I think; and there's an interest from their side on enhancing that. And our response is to meet them on that and say, "Yeah, we want that, too."

Because, in general, our feedback from most faculty is "Yes, we want that to happen. We want it to be allowed."

We want to not just have that as, say, the bargaining was on these faculty members, which was something added on, and no room made to address that. So ...

KB Who attended the training? Had the bargaining team already been selected?

DC Yes.

KB And how were they chosen?

DC How were they chosen. OK, the first answer is yes, the members – Pedro Bicchieri, Wendy Bohrson, me, Minerva Caples, Terry DeVietti, Peter Greis, Bob Hickey, Brenda Hubbard, Keith Lewis, Bob Otta, and I think Charlie Rubin – I think all of us actually were there at the training session at Moses Lake.

And then, the way these people were chosen, I can tell you it was with a lot of discussion. But Gary Pagels had three criteria, which is – I hope I can get these right – you had to be respected on campus among your peers; you had to be respected by Administration – not necessarily liked, but respected; and third is you had to have some common sense. You had to be willing to understand that you were here to do a job for all the faculty, and to be able to make a deal when you had to make a deal. And we weren't going to –

Those were his criteria. And so, in discussion, different names came up. We went down a list of faculty, we went down a list of members, we went down – we had some general discussions on – I think this was in January, 2005 – to try to educate the faculty on the bargaining process.

Well, some people showed up there. Primarily, a number of them, from the Geology Department, who said, "Well, this is now going to happen."

And, as I referred to earlier, from the group who, you know, some faculty who had said no to a union – not because they were anti-union, but just no to a union here – were now saying, "OK, well, now that it's here, let's go."

So they showed up at the meeting. They said, "What can we do? What can we do for you?"

KB Self-nominated.

DC Self-nominated by participating, by showing interest. Wendy Bohrson had experience in the Graduate Office in the – I think she was the Director of Undergraduate Research for at least a year. So know some – had some information about what was happening, how budgeting worked.

We had folks with a lot of experience, and basically, I think, Gary went and spoke with each member, whether they had been a “no” or a “yes,” and said, “This is what we would like. We would like you to be on the team. This is why. Do you want to do that?”

KB Have you had any objections from others about who was chosen?

DC Oh, yeah. We had some objections, saying, “We think somebody else should be on the team.”

And Gary’s answer has been “Thank you. We considered a lot of people. The team is up to 12, and we want it to go forward.”

And so when it was presented to our stewards’ group at that time, at the meeting in February, I believe it was, we had a discussion. We had a discussion about why some members weren’t there; why these members were; and what we thought that should do for us.

KB Could you say a little bit about the stewards’ group? What’s that?

DC Oh, the stewards’ group is still in formation, in some sense. But it’s a faculty – a steward is a faculty member from a department, who is a member of the union, whose job is to be the liaison between departmental faculty and the officers of the union.

KB So there are 33 stewards?

DC There are some 33 stewards. There are still a couple of departments where, unfortunately, we don’t have any union membership, and therefore, we don’t have a union steward.

We have a couple – well, I think, one person, for example – I can’t remember her name right now, so I hope you don’t ask me that – who serves as the – I use the term “liaison,” somebody I can contact and say, “Could you get this information out to your departmental members?”

KB Which departments are strongly supportive and which ones are keeping a distance?

DC Well, very strong supporters are – no surprise – the History Department is to be applauded. I think they have 100% membership. Others, off the top of my head: Geology; the Library is about 50-50; Psychology is a very strong support.

The Music Department has grown. Ever since the tentative agreement on the contract came out on the contract, they sat and went “Oh.” I talked to one member from the Music Department who said, “I wasn’t a union supporter, but I saw the contract and I joined.”

Because it just made them want to recognize the work that, I think, the bargaining team of the Faculty Union had done, and said, “Yeah, I have to join up now.”

Others, the English Department is a very strong supporter ... I’m trying to think ...

The College of Business is weak, in general, after some support from a few members in that college. And the College of the Sciences is pretty good. We’ve got good support from, say, Geography. And I mentioned Geology.

What else was I going to say? ... Anthropology, very good. Sociology. So, we’re growing.

KB And the weakest?

DC The weakest? College of Business and, let's see ... I think Industrial and Engineering Technology is a zero, as far as no members from that department. I'm trying to think if there's any other department right now that I know of that has no membership.

KB How's the School of Education?

DC The School of Education is pretty good in the Department of Education. But they also have ITAM [Information Technology and Administrative Management], which is about 40% members, I think. We have, I think, is HHPR [Health, Human Performance and Recreation] in ITAM, and Family and Consumer Sciences. And those are pretty low as far as membership right now.

KB What about our six centers?

DC The centers are mostly – well, some of them are, say, Psychology, and we have a number of supporters there.

We have – actually, from the centers, we have members from the College of Business, but all are employed at the centers. So, we have membership that way.

And, I think, the Law and Justice Program and INET have programs on the west side [of the state], for example. And, as of yet, I think we have one member from INET on the west side.

KB I want to ask you who served on the administrative team.

DC The administrative team, they had – I'm going to go basically left to right as how they sat at the table in Barge 412.

It was Becky Gubser from the Provost's Office, and the budget person in the Provost's Office. Deb Schriber-Barkley, who is now the administrative assistant to Michael Jennings, AVP for Faculty Affairs and Development.

And then they had – the person who ended up being their lawyer for the last few months, and who brought us to the end, Rod Younker from the Summit Law Group; who, I've got to tell you, will make you feel just a wisp of pain if you tell a lawyer joke in the future. He was a tremendously terrific professional, and helped us get where we go, just by –

Unfortunately, he's a really hard-nosed negotiator as well. But he's also – his respect for the process and of the members on our side of the table, helped us be able to get there, to reach an agreement.

And then, their Chair of their bargaining team was Wayne Quirk from the Graduate Office. Who usually sat next to him? ... I think it was Michael Chinn, who was the Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities, and has been here, I think, 10 to 15 years, and was former Department Chair in the Art Department. Tom Peischl, who's the Dean of the Libraries, and who has been on campus, I think, about two years. Michael Jennings, who's the new AVP, and has been here since late August.

KB Hired specifically for this purpose.

DC Hired specifically for this purpose; this, and Faculty Development. So when the union has some concern about what's happening, he's our contact. And when he has a concern that he needs to bring to the union's attention, he calls me.

And he was a former president of the ... what did they call it? ... United Academics, which was the union for the three research institutions and about 20 of the community colleges. They had some umbrella union, and he was president of that group for 10 years.

KB In Alaska.

DC In Alaska. And he's still, as he will tell you, a card-carrying member of, I think, two different unions – a dues-paying member of two different unions. And also brought his experience and his willingness to make a deal, and be part of the process, and keep it going forward.

When we had discussions with him when he first got here in August, both he and Gary looked at each other and said, "Why don't we shoot for Christmas to be done with bargaining?" Which is a pretty darn aggressive timeframe.

And they both said, "OK, let's do that." Which meant both sides had to say not only will we show up, we will show up and be willing to talk, and we'll be willing to find something that we can agree to that we think is good for the organization.

And I think we were really very successful at that.

KB Was there screaming and crying? What did the negotiations look like?

DC Negotiations ... they were a very ... are very much a learning process.

As it started out, late spring of 2005, I think the administrative team was still coming to it that, for example, they were still talking to the Senate. And a lot of that is the Senate will – [what] people with experience in the Senate will say is we kind of consult, but then we do what we choose. Our decision is our decision.

And the fundamental change is that on items that have to be negotiated – which is wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment – you can't walk away from the table on your own and do something. You have to reach an agreement with both sides.

And that was a learning process. And we hit a couple of brick walls. And we made it clear that we didn't like how the process was going, that we didn't think they understood, or they respected, the fact that they had to reach an agreement with us.

And we had a kind of a ... I don't know ... I guess not quite in a legal sense, but an impasse, in the sense that we thought we weren't going to make much progress. And we reached that conclusion some time in July, when we were still trying to negotiate some ... the COLA money that was appropriated by the State Legislature.

KB Which other universities in the state were given ... Administration distributed out money to faculty last September, right?

DC Right. Right. There had already been a plan. For example, at Western, their administration had already said, "OK, this is 4.6% over the two years from the Legislature, and we will make it a total of 9.5% over the two years, as a COLA to all faculty."

So, you know, in that environment, and the discussion we were having, and the interest we had had, with a number of us who had been – for example, Bob Hickey had been on the Budget Committee, the Senate Budget Committee, and I had been involved in discussions. So, you know, we knew.

Terry DeVietti had been on the Salary Administration Board for a number of years, and was also on the Executive Committee last year and this year of the Senate.

So we knew not only what was happening at other places, but also what the interest of the faculty was in regards to Salary Administration B money, and also COLA money; and the need for those two things to work together for us to get anywhere competitive with our peers.

And so, when we were trying to have that discussion and bring that forward as the Faculty Union bargaining team, we were reaching the same results that we met as the Senate Budget Committee and as the Senate Exec Committee.

KB Was that the major stumbling block?

DC Right. Well, that was our only negotiation during the summer. We were just trying to – the administrative team had approached us and said, "Let's just try to get this money taken care of."

"Sure," you know. One of our obligations – legal obligations – for bargaining in good faith is if somebody wants to talk to you, you have to show up and talk. So, we did.

And what happened is we – around July 20, I think it was – I'm not real firm on that date – we had what we thought was going to be a final session to talk about the money. And we took a caucus, which is a separate meeting of just our side, and looked at it and said, "You know, this isn't very good. As in, it's a mediocre agreement on money. And we could reach a mediocre agreement any time. And therefore, we're not going to reach this agreement."

"Why don't we go back in and say, 'We'll just make this discussion part of the overall negotiations. And when we get back to start talking about the full contract, this will be part of our negotiations'?"

And because we were in a different environment, we did that. And I think that was perceived as an aggressive, as well, on our part. I can tell you from our team's point of view it wasn't meant to be aggressive. But it was simply meant to be a decision that we could reach right now.

And we didn't have confidence, you know, any thought, that whatever other, that we could make any progress with, say, another meeting the next day, or the day after that.

KB There are no minutes of these meetings, though?

DC No actual public minutes, no, so ... although Deb Shriber-Barkley took minutes for their team, and Wendy Bohrsen, who was there in the summer, took minutes – or, took notes – for our team. So she has them.

So we said, "No, this isn't good enough right now." And when they came back in the room, we said, "This isn't meant to be a surprise. We really thought we'd be able to get done, but we can't. So we can't reach an agreement on this."

And to tell you the difference in the points of view, the administrative team did say, "Well, we might choose just to implement it on our own anyway," whatever their plan was.

And as spokesperson for our side, I said, "Please don't do that, because that's a unilateral implementation; and that would force us to take action that we don't want to take."

And they said, "Well, we might anyway."

And I simply repeated my caution. And as it turns out, they did not make a unilateral implementation, and we were able to – in late August – have a meeting – both teams, completely off the record – with a mediator from, I think it was, from the Federal Mediation and ... Conciliation Service? I think that's the right term – at a site off campus, just to get us out of this kind of mindset.

KB Who initiated that?

DC I think, with the arrival of Michael Jennings, and his experience on a bargaining team. Gary Pagels, I think, was the actual initiator of the idea. Because he and Michael had had a discussion off the record and Gary said, "Look, I think we need to do this. We need to talk about how we communicate at the table, because otherwise we're not going to get anywhere."

And so we had about a five- or six-hour session, with lunch. And had a discussion about why we thought we weren't getting anywhere.

And on our side, we kept saying, "Tell us what you think is stupid when we give you a proposal. Don't just say 'no.'" I mean, we literally said that.

I said, "I don't care if you think it's the biggest pile of bullshit you've ever seen, say that. Let's have a discussion. We all have experience. That's not a big deal to us. But you're going to have to back it up. I mean, you can call it crap, but we want to know why. And let's have the discussion."

And at one point, on their side, the Federal mediator said to, I think, two members on their side – and I don't know who else was listening, it was kind of an informal break-up period, and people milling around – and told them, "No, you on the administrative team cannot claim that you represent faculty in any way, shape or form. That's actually off base at this point. It's actually illegal for you to do that."

And what we'd heard in previous sessions, you know, during late spring and early summer, had been the Administration saying, "We think the faculty want this based on what's on the Code" – whatever – based on the distribution of money.

We on the Faculty Union were saying, "We represent the faculty. This is what we want to have happen with some of it."

So I think it was – it was very [End of Side 2]

(Transcription of Side 3)

KB This is Tape 2, and therefore Side 3, of Karen Blair's interview with Daniel CannCasciato on Friday, February 24, 2006, regarding the new union on campus.

DC Can you hit stop for a second? [tape recorder turned off] ... let them know that not only was it unwise for them to try and represent the faculty, or for the administrative team to assert that it was representing the faculty interests, but it was also simply illegal. Their job isn't to do that.

Just as we had had our training and been told “Don’t make the argument of the other team, make the argument for your side. You’re representing faculty. Your job is to do it in good faith. Your job is to try and get an agreement on the issues that have to be negotiated.”

And, you know, we had practice. And we had some discussion. We had somebody with 30 years of experience in doing that as well, and saying when – Gary Pagels being able to tell us “You can make a deal here” or “You can’t make a deal here.”

KB Did their side have training?

DC You know, I don’t know. From what we’ve been able to – you know, from watching them at the table, I would say no. It would seem like they did not get that.

I think the mediation service meeting – the meeting we had that I’m talking about right now, where we talked about how we communicated with each other and how –

KB It was in September?

DC Late August.

KB When Michael Jennings was new?

DC Michael Jennings was new. He wasn’t even on the payroll yet, but he was setting up his office and he had contact with us.

KB What was your inference in July when you said in the day that you could not continue to talk about COLA, and you were urging the administrative team not –

DC Not to implement unilaterally?

KB Right. What were you suggesting your steps might be if they did so?

DC Our steps would be ... really, I’m pretty sure that our only step is to file an unfair labor charge. Because the University is under a legal obligation to talk to us about wages. And if they simply – not to [just] “talk” to us; they are under legal obligation to reach an agreement with us. And we have an obligation to reach an agreement with them. It’s not, you know, that any side can just pout and say, “I don’t want to talk about it.”

And so if they had actually tried to implement something on their own, and assert that “Well, this is just the status quo implementation of this money,” we would have filed an unfair labor charge.

KB So, summer was pretty bumpy.

DC Summer was very bumpy. Yeah, it was amazingly discouraging ... well, yeah, it was profoundly discouraging.

KB So what changed in the fall and what did not change?

DC Well, what changed was, for example, after the August meeting where the University, some of the team, learned they don’t represent faculty. Which isn’t ... in a bargaining situation, it’s a “bad faith” idea, but in a human sense, it makes sense that they ... almost all of them have

served – well, almost all of them have been faculty either here or elsewhere. And, you know, they understand faculty interests as well.

You know, Michael Chinn, up until three years ago, was a Department Chair. So, you know, it's not bad faith on a human level, it's just something that – a role they no longer have, and have to let go of.

So what happened, I think, is they learned from Michael Jennings some of the changes in their role, and what they could and couldn't do. And what they should and shouldn't do.

They should no longer make, for example, their argument should be based on – when they bring forward a proposal or a counter-proposal – should be based on what we wanted – I'm sorry, it should be based on what they wanted, not simply aiming for a middle ground.

KB Now, in a sense, this COLA discussion in summer was premature.

DC Right.

KB The team had not arrived – consolidated – and so the real business would begin in the fall.

DC Right. And when they came forward in May of 2005 to say, "We would like to talk about the money," we were saying, "Great! Let's just talk about the COLA money, and leave merit or anything else out of this discussion until the fall. Let's just get this taken care of" – you know, we were thinking 5-minute discussion.

Hand it off to everybody as a COLA, and we'll leave the rest of the money till later. Because until you see the whole contract, and what plays off, you know, what things play off of each other, why talk about everything? Or, why get the money out of the way entirely?

And they really wanted to talk about COLA and merit, and maybe equity, maybe not equity. And so, I agree, it was – they were asking to get money taken care of before the contract negotiations, and remove compensation, in a sense, from the whole discussion.

And as it turns out, we weren't ready to go there. Plus, we didn't like what they were bringing forward anyway. We didn't think it would be a good deal for faculty.

Or, really, for the organization. That was one of our concerns as a team, and has remained such, is that yeah, we're interested in faculty and doing something that's good for faculty. But it also has to be in the context of being good for the organization, for the University.

Because we're a State University, we're all, in a sense, stewards of a tremendous resource of the State. And that's something that we have to be aware of, and willing to answer to – at least to ourselves, if nobody else. Ask "Why is this good for the University?" If somehow we had figured out that the faculty only had to teach one class a year, as tenure track, why is that good for the University?

If you can't answer that question to the State, then you're probably not arguing for something that's really good.

KB Now, I want –

DC You have to keep that in mind.

KB As the first campus in Washington State to negotiate a contract, you had no role models nearby to lean on.

DC No. No, but we had – well, we had – you know, there are a lot of publicly available contracts to look at. And we had our history here, which is what we really wanted to continue at, which is most faculty – not all, of course – thought that most of the conditions, as written up in the Faculty Code, would have been OK, if they'd been implemented pretty much as written in the Faculty Code as well.

And so, we didn't – you know, when you look at the contract and compare it in many ways to conditions in the Faculty Code, there aren't huge changes, until we get to, say, workload. Which is a big change.

For example, sabbatical leave, we kept – I mean, it's probably 90% word for word exactly from the Code. So we tried to keep things familiar, both for – because there was no driving need to change, or a sense of urgency from the faculty that a lot of things were broken; but also, for continuity and training, and comfort level with faculty when we bring forward a contract that "Oh, this is familiar, I know what this means," we can implement it without things going wrong.

KB So from the autumn until January, you focused on the parts of the Faculty Code that the faculty thought were not respected by the Administration?

DC Well, we focused on all those things in the Faculty Code that we wanted in the contract in some way. And we didn't highlight anything that was specifically not respected or respected.

Most of the concerns from faculty that I've heard, a lot of them have to do with, first, salaries; as in, how were they assigned? And, you know, a widespread dissatisfaction is, a new faculty comes in, and that person's salary is 10 or 15% above that of somebody who has been here for three years. And, oddly enough, and not too surprising at all, no faculty member who has just been leapfrogged can see a really valid reason for that.

And also, on the promotion and tenure end of things, when faculty gets surprised is when they're coming out for tenure, and thinks things have gone along well for five years. But "How is it that I am not getting tenure? What happened?"

Or, "Why am I not being reappointed for my third year when everything seemed fine, and nobody was giving me any notice in advance that this was an issue?"

You know, those kinds of isolated incidents. But they're all – across the colleges, I can tell you – are items we were concerned about. And, as it turns out, so was the Administration. Because they have no interest in sandbagging somebody, you know, as a policy. Nobody really wants that to happen.

And we do recognize that when you hire somebody, you've gone through, if nothing else, the expense of the hiring process. So, *bygod*, why not try to ensure them success?

And we think that in both the workload portion of the contract and then the evaluation process – which are tied together and involve sort of a conversation, or a dialog, among them – that you evaluate somebody based on what they said they were going to do, and what you've agreed they should be doing, so that the element of surprise is at least reduced quite substantially.

So, those were the kinds of things that we were aware of. And what we also wanted to get rid of from the Code was ambiguity, namby-pamby language, things that could be interpreted a number of ways, as much as possible.

And one thing that the contract does have in it, which I think the Code did as well, is an element of trust. If you say that this is going to happen, then we are going to do this ... whatever.

Again, the workload article. Then, are we going to also write 40 pages of text on how we do this? Or, are we going to say *that* we will do it? We all know where we want to go with it. We all know how we want it to happen. We're not going to micromanage, you know, have the Provost micromanage everybody down to the department and the individual faculty member any more than he's interested in [doing] right now, which doesn't happen.

We aren't seeing a big sea change there. Faculty development funds for tenure-track faculty full-time – well, at least for tenure-track faculty, \$700 a year at their discretion – at the faculty member's discretion – is a *minimum*. Everybody knows that minimum.

We didn't then designate how much would be above that, because currently we don't do that. And currently, we know that there is money out there. And everybody proceeds as though there will be other money out there.

And so we said, "OK. As long as we're not seeing – as long as the minimum isn't synonymous with the maximum" – which would cause heartburn, you know, across all colleges – "we're good to go."

And that was the spirit of the negotiation at the end. Earlier in the fall, it wasn't. And it was a much more painful process, because the element of trust and dialog wasn't there.

And also, for what it's worth, the conduct of their other lawyer, who wasn't Rod Younker, but the person who was their primary lawyer, was, I would say, more antagonistic towards faculty in his conduct at the table. And therefore, it was harder to have a discussion to understand what the actual point of view was on the administrative side, if they had a disagreement with a proposal we put forward.

And it was also, you know, there were occasionally personally insulting comments made just kind of towards faculty in general, or just somebody specifically at the table, which is, if nothing else, not a – it's kind of [inaudible].

KB His name?

DC Pardon me?

KB His name?

DC His name? Tom Hustoles from Michigan. A guy with a tremendous amount of skill and experience and all that. You know, this is apparently his chosen method for negotiating.

At one point, I can say, which isn't too specific, was he once said that the language that we had in a contract – it was about, I think, equipment – used terms that, you know, "You might find in a contract with foundry workers and people in factories, but not in a professional contract."

And, you know, we thought about it. And Keith Lewis, who is in the Art Department, and actually oversees a very small foundry, said, "You know, I think we have two working foundries on campus."

But we had to take time for that, rather than – it really didn't matter to us whether our contract sounded – uh – used only terms that you'd find in whatever, a professional contract would be. Or, what we were more concerned with is that it reflected our life here.

And so when we made reference to "tools," it was because a couple members of our bargaining team used tools that are, you know, handheld implements, rather than, you know, the tools that a lot of us use in academic, which are books and journals and the computer, and articles and scholarship in different ways.

So that was a fairly substantive obstacle to our process. And as it turns out, Tom Hustoles fell ill and Rod Younker had to step in. And he was back-up for all the campuses.

He's also now the lead negotiator for the administrative team at Eastern [Washington University], and Tom Hustoles had been there as well. So –

KB So Jennings never even met Hustoles.

DC No, Jennings did meet Hustoles. Hustoles was here in ... through October; and missed, I think, one day in October, which is when Rod Younker came in.

And we went "Oh." Rod Younker conducts himself at the table the way we thought we could all conduct ourselves at the table, and have an actual discussion, you know.

The faculty who were on the bargaining team are, I think, known to all faculty as pretty reasonable folks. You know, when you know any one of these folks, you know that they're pretty reasonable, although they're very strong-minded. They aren't spineless by any means, but they are reasonable. And they will be practical. And they will represent faculty well.

And we expected on the administrative team that to happen as well. And that the conduct would be professional, collegial, because when we leave the bargaining table and Barge Hall, for the most part, we also then all know each other in some way socially. You know, we may run into each other at the landfill, at the grocery store, at the gym, you know, in all different ways, on different committees on campus.

KB So the bulk of the progress went from Halloween till past Christmas – you didn't make it at Christmas – but through January.

DC Right. And I think you're right. The bulk of the progress, especially since the most contentious issues – workload, the roles of tenure-track faculty and the roles of non-tenure-track faculty, those two articles, and compensation – were all done in November, December and January.

And those all entailed us to be able to sit down and talk. And being able to listen really well to what their concern was. And then, being able to say, "What are your concerns? What are you trying to prevent from happening to your folks?" Or, "What do you want to have happen? What's the condition that you're hoping to have happen? Where can we meet on this?"

KB And was Pagels very directive with your team, or ...?

DC Directive? Oh, right. Talking about the way we communicated.

While I think the administrative team had some misconceptions about what the Faculty Union group represented, I think they were also put off, or they thought it was very aggressive.

Because when we first started, our conduct of our team at the table was that one person spoke. In general, especially at the beginning, it was Gary, because in general, he was speaking to Tom Hustoles. And Tom was the only person who spoke for the administrative team.

And occasionally, more of their members would speak up, and occasionally contradict each other; which is, you know, when we went to our training very early on, we learned that you don't want that to happen.

It doesn't matter what your discussion is as a caucus or, you know, in your bargaining prep sessions, and how diverse or how across the board – you know, if it ever came to the point where we had to take a vote, and it would have been six yes and five no, when we got to the table, it was eleven yes.

KB So for every hour you spent with the administrative team, you had already met –

DC Oh, yeah. For *hours* in advance. We knew what we were going into, what our position was, what we wanted to accomplish. But when we got there, only person spoke.

And I think they thought that was ... well, they knew it was different, because that's really not the way you conduct anything in the Senate. And with faculty in general, everyone just speaks. It's really willy-nilly.

In a sense – although I don't think strategically it's the real issue – it's easy to divide and conquer, in the sense of where the divisions are; where you find out where you can go to get more of what *you* want, if you're on the administrative side.

And at the bargaining sessions for us, for our bargaining team, that didn't happen. Because nobody else spoke. If somebody asked us a direct question, which happened a couple of times, we would not answer, because our spokesperson was Gary, or in different sessions, our spokesperson was Gary and me, and at different times, it would have been Wendy or Charlie or Keith. You know.

We would choose. We would know who was going to talk. And as we progressed, and as we – especially, you know, in October, we had some pretty good – we started having discussions. And then, at that time, you know, if we had concerns – as our team members did – we would write a note. And we would say ... and hand it off, and give it to whoever our spokespeople were.

Or, if it ever came to it – and I don't think it ever did, in the process – we would have just written "Caucus," which was take a break; time out for this session; have the administrative team leave and then talk, because something urgent had come up, and we thought that something was being missed.

So that was our discipline and that's the way we conducted ourselves. And I think initially, it was seen as ... probably as very severe and aggressive, in a sense, rather than just disciplined.

And as with, in retrospect, all things that happen to do with communication problems comes from also a lack of communication. And they never said, "Why the hell don't your people talk?"

And our answer would have been simple. And we finally did have that question come up in ... it might have been at the August session. We just said simply, "That's not the way we conduct ourselves."

The union, in a sense – I mean, the fact of unionizing – the union is the voice of the faculty for these issues. And so, in kind of a case study or microcosm, the bargaining team is the parts of the faculty in all the issues under discussion, and this one person is the voice of the faculty on this matter – or these three people.

And that was our view. And it worked well, because then you don't have somebody saying on our team, just willy-nilly saying, "Oh, yeah, you're right. We can do that."

Even if we know that we're going to go there. Even if in our prep sessions, we said, "OK, we're going to fight on this up until 11:55, and then we're going to go with their view, because we can, and it's OK. But we're going to see if we can move them."

Because as it turns out, you know, one of our initial concerns was "Well, why are we arguing this if we know where we're going to go?"

And the point is to have people learn to communicate with you; to have them learn that you really wanted this and why. And then say, "But in the interest of an agreement, we'll use what you wrote entirely." Or, "We'll use what you wrote 90%. We want these three changes. What do you say?"

And that is an experience, you know, that accrues some benefits over time, with people recognizing that – on the other team – that say, "Oh, OK. You will make a deal. You will agree with us. You will not ..."

You know, for a while, we were getting a lot of articles back from the administrative team that simply lined through everything that we had written in our article, and supplanted it with words, all the words that they had written. *All new.*

And if you get a number of those back, that breaks your trust in what's really going on; and how much are they listening; and what's your status as peers.

And when things started coming back 50-50 – our language lined out, some language kept, some line-ins for their new language and *why* – we really started picking up steam, and being able to move.

KB Now, we've talked a lot about the style and not much about the substance.

DC Right.

KB Is it premature to move to the issues that you're proud of, and the changes that are disappointing?

DC No! No, I think the things we're very proud of are workload, evaluation, and the grievance process – which is cleaner than it was in the Code. I think the workload process, and the way that it has the potential to help faculty balance what their expectations are, to having the University be able to make adjustments for individuals. And then also, see individuals at different times in their careers.

So, a faculty member coming up, or looking forward to tenured promotion in three years, can negotiate; and the Chair and the department can make adjustments to say, "Oh, good. We want this person to do this," for example. And allot them this time, and be able to remove a teaching burden for this amount of time, to help assure success – which is one of our kind of obligations and goals as a profession.

And then, being able to say, for example, "Karen's been here 20 years, and we would like her to write a book." Or, "She has the opportunity to be involved with this international committee. But that means that probably in the scholarship area, she will be somewhat fallow. We won't be seeing activity there for the next three years, because this is a huge increase over here, and we still have these issues over here – for teaching or primary duties as department chair – that we really want to have happen. But this is a great opportunity for Karen, and for the department, and for the University. This is what we want to have happen for Karen and for us and our students as well."

So, being able to make that adjustment and say, "Oh, yeah." Then, when it comes up to post-tenure review, nobody's surprised.

Nobody says, "Oh, but you never did anything over here."

"No, we didn't want to. Everybody agreed upfront."

In theory, it won't even be a question.

And being able to make those adjustments – where faculty can say, "Oh, a grant came in. Somebody in the Sciences got \$5M. That means these changes have to be made."

And we have a very good means of addressing that, and having that discussion go through and be fulfilled. I think it's a great, you know, a really positive change.

KB I hear your pride in the general language that permits such changes. Practically, though, I'm wondering if a professor who needs time to write a book, gets it.

DC Right.

KB Or if his colleagues are going to have to teach his students.

DC No, because the understanding – this is where, you know, when I talked earlier about trust, and whether or not we have, say, a 70-page contract or a 350-page contract – is that when we discussed this, we said, "This will mean, in some senses, the use of non-tenure-track faculty to pick up the general classes that might have to be taught."

Or, if there's faculty available to teach a class in a major, that this person now won't be teaching. That it's not just a shifting of the overall burden among the existing number of faculty members. That there will be a cost against achieving our overall goal of higher activities in the areas of, you know, applied scholarship, if you want to call it that, on committees, national committees, if it has something to do with it. Or, fulfilling the grant requirement for research, or whatever it is.

Or, you know, somebody in the Arts has a big show – I'm trying to think – you know the [inaudible] of Venice. You might want to give this person a lot of time there, but it might cost the University as a whole. But it's a good thing, because it's good for the University.

It's great for our students to know that faculty members are doing this. And what that person not only develops in preparing for that, and the influence that students get, but when that person comes back – and that experience and that exposure and those contacts.

So that's ... I guess one of the things that isn't in black and white in the contract is the dialog that went on, the understanding, and the agreement with the faculty and the Administration in making this work; and what the full environment, of implementing it and making it work, really means. But that's part of it.

You asked about disappointments. I don't have anything specific, as far as a disappointment, except that a couple things that we didn't get to that I really think we need to talk about in the future at some point, at least now. But it is something that we'll need to find out if faculty really wants us to take it forward in the future.

One of those will be Chairs, and the duties of the Chairs; and the way that reassigned time and compensation is decided upon, and what that might mean.

Because if you're a Chair of a department that might have three programs delivered at three of the University centers, versus a Chair of a department that doesn't, there are some inherent differences there that are right now not very well addressed. Or, certainly, not clearly addressed, in that people understand it beforehand.

And that's really one of the goals of the contract. People should be able to look at what they're entering into if they say they'll be a Chair. And being able to predict, with some degree of certainly, what that will mean.

So, that's one. The area of summer school is another. We simply went with the status quo, the agreement that had been in place over the last ... I don't know, five years, probably. Only because it's [End of Side 3]

(Transcription of Side 4)

... policy right now. Which isn't to say that if we do a full negotiation on it that it won't end up being exactly the same – I mean, there's no guarantee of a change. But we really didn't have a full discussion on it, and that would be an area I think we really need to look at.

The other area, or one area I think is a great improvement and a really good thing, is the intellectual property piece – in the way it's handled, the way – and the way that it's written into the contract, in that it's now University policy. And it was fast-tracked to get approved by the board before we reached tentative agreement on it for the contract.

And within that, a little short article in the contract that says that "No change to this University policy will be made without negotiation with the Faculty Union." Which is rare, if not unique, to be able to have a University policy that affects people who *aren't* our members, who *aren't* faculty, be something that we negotiate, because primarily, of course, it will affect faculty.

And what we said was "If it doesn't, if it's something that can be changed by folks outside of the negotiation process, then we want a separate policy that's in the contract. Because we want to negotiate for our group."

And they said, "Well, we wanted a University policy. But we agreed to negotiate only with you."

Which is, you know, a huge concession, really, on their side. And also, I think, a really tangible demonstration of what the negotiations got to at the end.

KB Although cleaner than having two separate policies, especially as those two constituencies might well be working on the same grant.

DC Exactly. Yes. So there is really a benefit, I think, for them as well, in being able to understand who to – what one group to negotiate with, and one policy.

And it's also an area of kind of trust – that we will work together in the future on this.

KB Will the same team continue to refine this?

DC The same bargaining team for the contract? No, in the future, we'll have a different bargaining team. And really, that's one of the saddest things about that; that eventually, this will be ratified ... probably on March 3, by the Board of Trustees.

And then, I imagine, I would like us to have one last bargaining team meeting. But really, you know, that's when you break up the team.

KB Surely there will be some continuity, no?

DC Oh, I would guess. But that process is something that we have to produce in the future.

KB Will you stay involved, or are you burned out?

DC Well, I would – if I'm President of the [Faculty] Union, I really don't want to be on the bargaining team again, just because the workload was kind of overwhelming.

KB Well, it won't be that demanding in the future, will it?

DC Not for the re-openers. Because in August of 1997 – er, of 2007 – we will have re-openers on up to two articles each, whether they're in the contract or new things, and on economics. So that should be fairly contained. And the workload, you're right, should not be anything like this.

In the future, though, for example ... predicting it, I guess, is difficult. Because it could be a good process, and it could be a fairly low-workload kind of process, to renegotiate the entire contract.

However, Eastern [Washington University at Cheney] is renegotiating a previously existing contract that they had as an agreement with their administration, but now doing one under the new legislation. And they started before we did. They had a pre-existing contract. And we're done, and they're not.

So, depending on the personnel on our side, on their side, there are no guarantees, I guess.

I'm really very optimistic. And yes, I will be involved in some way, I think, because it is interesting. And it was very rewarding. *At the end.*

There were times [chuckles] when no, it wasn't, for anybody. But at the end, this has been, I think, one of the really substantive, positive steps for the University and for the faculty. It's really nice to be part of that.

KB Now, the final contract was circulated to the faculty late January, 2006.

DC Right.

KB And the vote was very supportive.

DC Right.

KB But between those two events, there were several forums where faculty quizzed the team. What were the faculty concerns, and delights, with what your team had achieved?

DC I think the main area of delight, as you say, was the economics. Because faculty here have not have a COLA in I don't know how long, but it's been at least five years.

KB COLA stands for what?

DC Cost-of-living adjustment; so, just a general scale adjustment to all faculty. So, we have that.

KB But that is mandated by the State, am I right?

DC Well, the State mandated 4.6% over two years, and we've agreed to – with the Administration – 8.25% over the two years.

Plus, our non-tenure-track faculty, who are a substantive part – probably 40-45% of our union membership, our faculty membership – actually, in headcount, they may be above 50%, because there are a number of faculty in that rank, or that category, who teach one or two classes a year – get not only a cost-of-living adjustment; but a number of them, who have been on annual contract for more than 10 years, will get a change in title to that of senior lecturer, instead of just lecturer. And, will get an adjustment of 10%, as well.

So, for some of them, by next fall, they will see about an 18% increase in their salaries – which is just tremendous – as well as, I think, what we've also got, which is really a better recognition of their status and their employment, and some of the human – the human part of human resources, in the treatment and dealing with them.

And a commitment – again, this is the trust issue – a commitment to annual contracts when appropriate, rather than quarterly contracts. And a commitment to a review process, from our side, a review of the annual faculty, the non-tenure-track faculty. Because after five years at a certain percentage, then they can try to be adjusted up to senior lecturer, and get also that 10% advancement in pay.

KB If all adjuncts will receive the benefits of the union contract, why should they join the union?

DC Right. Why should anybody join the union, if this happens and applies to everybody? That's a good question – and for tenure-track faculty as well.

One of the main reasons is – well, I guess two reasons that I can think of right off the top of my head. One is because our dues pay for our support from our state and national affiliates. They are the group that is supporting, for example, Gary Pagels coming here.

And, for the last five months, AnnMargaret Mastropaolo from Florida has been flying in weekly as well, from Fort Lauderdale. She flies in on Monday. She and Gary get in a car together and drive over here. And she's learning the process, but she has been a lot of support for us, and has a lot of experience.

And so, our dues support the support that we get.

Also, our dues – or, being a member – means that when the administrative team looks at the bargaining team representatives across the table, or look at me as a representative of the union, or another officer as a representative of the union, they know they're looking at, say, 500 people, who are committed members.

Which will really diminish the chance of them ever looking at the Faculty Union representative and saying, "Oh, you don't really represent the faculty. We do. We know what the faculty interests are, on the administrative team – you don't."

When we say, "No, we have 500 members," then they know that your commitment as a faculty member is really strong to the process. And they know, on the administrative side, that respecting that process, and committing to it, and being proactive in that process, benefits them as well, because we've already got our folks signed off on it.

And, you know, the contract – there are some dramatic changes in the contract, workload being one of the biggest ones. And I think if anybody would sit down and try to think of what it would take to get that sort of change done through the Faculty Senate process, and the nightmare that that would be; and thinking, oh, we'd get that done in five months is – I mean, they are very different venues.

KB We took a detour. You didn't talk about the nervousness that was expressed by faculty who showed up at your forums.

DC Right! Nervousness. A lot of the nervousness is, for example, the "minimum for faculty development." Is the minimum the maximum?

The answer is "No." And "Are you sure?" And the answer is "Yes."

"Can you trust them?" We actually got asked that. "Do you trust that this will be fulfilled the way that it was presented and discussed at the table?"

And all the members of the bargaining team, who have had – are some of the more skeptical faculty members on campus as well are on this team – said, "Yes."

Unanimously. It's not a question. We believe that we do have that relationship, and that that will happen.

And that's a big change for a lot of the faculty to say, "OK, then I can support this."

And a lot of people who aren't union supporters, and who aren't going to join because of whatever their political or social view is, came in and said, "This is really good. Nice job. You guys are to be commended."

That was their statement sitting down at the discussion session. And then, they just had questions of clarification, not a lot of – there was some nervousness. One person deeply about the grievance process being fatally flawed. Nobody else has that concern.

So, there were idiosyncratic, I guess, or individualistic concerns. The overall nervousness was “Is the workload thing going to be a huge paperwork burden?” And the answer for most faculty is “It could be. But probably not. It doesn’t have to be. Because you can work it out with your Chair. It can be a one-page sheet.”

Luckily, we had someone stay from Economics, Peter Saunders, who says, “Well, we’ve been doing this in our department, and it’s two pages. We will outline what we’re going to do, what we want to do, what we’re expecting. And the Chair and us, we sign off on it and we’re fine.”

Now, I’ve had similar experiences, both at the Library and at my previous employer, the University of Oregon.

So, overall, pretty good. And I think the vote reflects that as well: 96% voted yes, 4% voted no, which is about – I think 80% of the union members voted. So that’s a pretty good representation.

But right now, only about 25% of faculty are union members. And in the future ... and it is growing, and I expect it will continue to grow.

KB I know you have an appointment very soon. Do you have any last thoughts, topics, information that we didn’t cover?

DC No. Except just to say that I think that the administrative team did a very good job of ... I don’t know ... I think “defending their turf” is the wrong term – you know, I think it’s kind of the perception – but recognizing their legitimate and very legal role; that as the employer, they have the right to everything that they don’t give up, really, in a contract.

But by recognizing that what’s in a contract, and what demonstrates a working life to our faculty, is not only good for the faculty here, and clear to them as implementers of that faculty as the employers, but for recruitment and retention as well.

And, you know, I think having, as much as possible, in a kind of inherently adversarial discussion process, the broad view that – and accepting that – we’re working for the same thing you’re working for – the Faculty Union. We have the same goals. We have a different way of getting there, you have a different way of getting there. Let’s figure out what we can do together.

And we got there. We did get to that kind of relationship; and November, December, January were good growing months in that. And keeping that going is, I think, our – is *incumbent* upon us. Because we started something here that we have to make successful.

KB Will we continue to have AFT help – visit – at least on a regular basis?

DC Oh, yes. Yes. And I have Gary’s phone number. I have his home number as well.

KB Well, thank you so much. I learned so much!

DC Thank you.